

78 01163

ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING  
FROM THE LOCAL TO THE REGIONAL LEVEL

The San Francisco Bay Area Experience

*Reg. plan -- CA -- SF Bay area*  
*Environ. pol*  
*ABOG*

Presented at the American Institute of Planners  
Annual Convention at Atlanta, Georgia, October, 1973

*no slip*

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

JAN 31 1978

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Michael Wornum

Chairman, Association of Bay Area Governments  
Regional Planning Committee

78 01163

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG 29 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA



## SUMMARY

The theme of this paper is that the local governments and regional special purpose districts are failing to halt environmental degradation; that a regional-multi purpose government is necessary to implement effective environmental planning and make the needed trade-offs between social and economic goals.

A brief factual survey of the San Francisco Bay Area is made with a description of its present outstanding environmental qualities and the forces which are threatening them. The counterbalancing social and economic concerns are stated with a conclusion that protecting the environment is vital to all societal goals.

The issue of no-growth is taken up and the policies and actions of local jurisdictions examined in relation to the implementing tools of service curtailment, zoning, and environmental impact. It is postulated that local action alone is inadequate and growth management can only be rationally planned on a Regional level. The various forces advocating and opposing growth limitation are then analyzed.

The Association of Bay Area Government's (ABAG) recent policy on growth management is described with particular reference to open space planning, both as a method for guiding urban growth and its several intrinsic environmental benefits. But it is recognized that presently ABAG is relatively powerless, that environmental planning and enforcement is pre-empted by a succession of Regional special purpose districts. These principally consists of air and water pollution control districts, a sewer service agency, Bay and Coastal planning agencies and a transportation commission. These are described, giving their composition, role and effectiveness, with examples of the resultant inevitable conflicts between uncoordinated and often competing agency goals. Additionally Federal and State agencies profoundly influence Regional and local environmental planning.

Although each agency is doing a reasonable job within its own sphere of responsibility, the collective achievement leaves much undone. A semi-mythical scenario is presented where different agencies in order to achieve their own objectives try to direct the Regions' growth in four separate directions with the result that all lack some vital service and do damage to the environment in specific sectors. Other selected examples of lack of governmental coordination are given.


The obvious solution is presented. The formulation of a multi-purpose Regional planning agency with mandatory review powers which can determine total Regional population and rate of growth and broad allocation to sub-regional areas so that air, water, transportation, etc., planning can be based on similar parameters and be responsibly coordinated. At present ABAG exists as the only government which is both General Purpose and Regional but it is relatively powerless and its principal weapon, A95 review of its members grants, is increasingly useless.





## SUMMARY (CONTINUED)

ABAG is sponsoring state legislation (AB 2040) to create an effective Regional Planning district. It is the latest of a long series of similar endeavors and appears at present to be also headed for failure. The forces successfully fighting its formation are described; also its proponents whom it is contended will eventually prevail. For the Bay Area is still an area of outstanding environmental quality and its inhabitants will soon realize it is in jeopardy and take action for its preservation.



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024 with funding from  
State of California and California State Library

<https://archive.org/details/C123309222>



The San Francisco Bay Region of Northern California has a population of almost 5 million, with an anticipated increase to 7½ million by the year 2000. It produces a gross Regional product of \$35 billion, a quarter of the state total. It consists of 9 counties, 93 cities and almost 1,000 Special Districts. Its area is 7,460 square miles. The above statistics hardly do justice to the image of the Region however. It could better be described as an area of incredible beauty and infinite variety, of forests, hills, and plains surrounding a Bay of ever changing moods and blessed with the best climate in the world. Inot this paradise have poured an increasing number of people who have built an ever expanding urban complex around the Bay. Its beauty and climate pulls in refugees from Los Angeles, from New York and many other areas where the battle to save their environment is being rapidly lost. Ironically these immigrants, plus the large internal increase resulting from such a benevolent environment, is in danger of destroying the very environment and climate that attracted the newcomers and sponsored the natural increase.

The ominous signs are not hard to read. For an increasing number of days the view southward from the top of Mount Tamalpais is obscured by a noxious yellow pall hanging over the Bay. The catch of its world famous crab has dwindled to almost nothing as their breeding stops in water fouled from sewer outfalls and industrial wastes. The Bay, which gives the Region its name and character, was rapidly being filled and its invaluable marshes were being transformed into garbage dumps. The coast was being built up and becoming inaccessible. The Central cities are congested with automobiles, with increasing noise and with too many people fighting for scarce space. The suburbs, where the more fortunate hoped to have escaped to enjoy the then unsullied country, are now epitomized by Freeway, Shopping Centers and "ticky tacky", (from a song spawned in the Bay Area) houses climbing up the erstwhile golden hillsides, proceeded by the bulldozer and followed by slides and floods. The fear is growing that San Francisco is becoming "Manhattanized" and the suburbs are becoming "Los Angelised". These symptoms are no different from the rest of urban America except that the environment of the Bay Region is not yet destroyed and still worth saving. Other Regions as Minneapolis-St. Paul or the State of Vermont, might be ahead in certain of their efforts, but I believe that the successes and the failures of this Region's actions are of value in their guidance to others.

Before examining some of these problems and solutions, it is necessary to examine the concern of many that the current emphasis on environmental preservation is at the cost of needed social and economic objectives. Unquestionably some of the suburban activists inflate environmental concern as covert justification for exclusionary and discriminatory policies. Nevertheless concern over environmental problems is a real one. An increasinsly degraded environment, irreversible consumption of scarce resources and an increasing quantity of hard to assimilate gaseous, liquid and solid wastes hurt both rich and poor alike. But they always hurt the poor more. The unpalatable answer to those only emphasizing social concerns is that the rich have and certainly will better be able to survive, in an adverse environment. The brunt of the cost will be born by the poor.





This is not to say that environmentalists can ignore social concerns. Man has become an integral part of the natural ecology. He is not separate. Therefore his basic social and economic needs must be accepted if he is to survive on this planet. But it is above survival levels (and determining them is admittedly difficult) that the trade-offs have to be made between marginal increases in material benefits as against further environmental damage. Specifying these trade-offs and their distribution are far beyond the scope of this paper. Suffice to say that the environmental movement must be aware of the necessity of making them; of realizing that a good environment also consists of a place to live and a place to work and all that implies, as well as a place to play and contemplate. Otherwise the movement is liable to die prematurely under charges of inhumanity and elitism.

The hypothesis of this paper is that the metropolitan Region, if logically defined as a natural geographical, social, political and economic entity is perforce, by similar definition, the logical arena for preserving the environment in which it's people live. Examination must be made of local government activities below and State and Federal roles and activities above the Regional level as the Region is but one level in an interconnected hierarchy. Its analysis in isolation would therefore be invalid. But hopefully the Region's pivotal role in environmental planning will become apparent as the paper develops.

Two parallel but interrelated approaches for solving the Region's problems are being implemented. First is the quantitative concern--that by prohibiting or severely limiting population growth, further environmental degradation will be halted. Second is the qualitative approach of controlling the location and effect of growth in such a way that its baleful effects on the environment are minimized.

The first, the concept of "No-Growth" has almost become the new religion in planning circles. This is in sharp reaction to the erstwhile strong belief in the inevitability and beneficence of growth in the just past decade of the 60's. As was mentioned above, some have used the "No-Growth" concept as an expedient method to continue to confine the "disadvantaged" and hence "undesirables" to the central cities. But hopefully the more overt and certainly more legitimate motive of most is to preserve the endangered environment from a continuing unbearable load. The obvious way to halt further degradation is to stop more people arriving, and if absolute prohibition is not feasible, at least limit as much as possible the amount and rate of growth, especially in critical areas.

Up to now the local areas have taken leadership in this movement. Often by the "Initiative" followed belatedly by the City Councils and Boards of Supervisors. Local action will be discussed prior to examining Regional response as the discerned gaps and consequent problems of purely local action will give guidance as to what supplementary action is needed at the Regional





level, a strategy of equating the Region to a mini Federal System. The more rapidly growing suburban communities are where most of the action has occurred but they are now being followed by similar anti-growth movements in the core cities. Local impetus manifests itself in many ways. A leader is the small suburban community of Petaluma, (30,000 plus pop.) which has imposed a strict quota system of housing starts, allowing a maximum of 500 a year. These are selected at one time each year using a weighted scale of social, economic and aesthetic criteria with those rejected joining the accumulating applications for the subsequent year. Other cities and counties are considering adopting such a quota system pending the outcome of a current law-suit. They are leery of proceeding in new methods without judicial clearance following the courts throwing out of the successful Livermore and Pleasanton initiative to limit their growth. In the meantime they are drastically reducing the total holding capacity through revision of their General Plans. San Jose, with over half a million population and up to recently the fastest growing city in the Region has completely reversed its policy and now has a moratorium on annexation and restriction on neighborhood growth based on increasing strain on municipal and educational services as spelled out in its "Urban Development Policies" paper of April, 1972.

The core cities are beginning to move in the same direction. Alvin Duskin, an environmental activist, almost succeeded in sponsoring an initiative to limit all new buildings in San Francisco to 40 feet in height. The United Neighborhood Councils are unanimously on record with the Board of Supervisors to impose moratoriums on further apartment houses in many neighborhoods pending drastic reductions in allowed densities. In Berkeley, there is now a regulation prohibiting tearing down older homes and replacing them with apartments without approval of the surrounding residents.

The three prevailing tools used to implement these policies are service curtailment, zoning, and Environmental Impact Statements.

Using service curtailment springs from the belief that local government, based on their past performances, is both unwilling and unable to control growth. The most effective way therefore to fight growth is to fight any expansion of service facilities, particularly effective being sewer and water. In Marin, a ban on new sewer connections has been imposed by the Regional Water Quality Board. There has been little local action to end the ban by upgrading the facilities and little popular opposition to its continuance. In fact it is welcomed by many as a convenient way to limit growth without the legal hazards of a locally imposed moratorium. Even more telling has been the rejection by an 80% majority of a large recent water bond issue. Subsequent to this rejection, the water district has imposed a County wide moratorium on new connections pending another smaller bond issue which also failed. It was opposed by such prestigious local organizations as the Conservation League who see continuing restrictions on water supply as a much





more effective growth limiting tool than the tentative proposals for growth control proposed to implement the recently adopted County Wide Plan. The fact that no water means no growth at all and thus runs entirely contrary to the social and economic goals of the plan is secondary to the assurance that its environmental goals will thus assuredly be met. As will be seen utility constraint is also a potentially powerful Regional planning tool for growth control.

Zoning, of course, is the traditional tool to limit density and is being fully utilized to restrict development and hence growth. Every zoning hearing transcends professional planning concerns to become a hotly contested political fight between the local community and the developer. The developer is often somewhat futilely supported by the planners, who, wistfully believing in social goals, favor the higher density demanded by the developer in return for an equivalent number of lower cost units for lower income residents. Such units of course are anathema to the local residents whose views generally prevail at the council level, where political survival depends on lowering density, with the natural consequence of removing the hated lower cost units. Such fights are generally followed by attempts to purchase the property for open space and/or down zone it to a much lower density. The new State law that requires zoning to conform to General Plans has reinforced this trend. This has sponsored a new crop of revisions to General Plans which invariably show a much lower holding capacity which then legally has to be converted into down-zoning action. The problem with local zoning is twofold. First it does not specify "when" or at "what rate" only "where". Thus it is not a very effective tool to control growth over time. Secondly as a local tool to limit holding capacity itself it can work reasonably well. But to implement the Regional plan it fails, ABAG Issue Paper #3 showing the Region is presently zoned to permit a population of 25 million, as against a present population of 4.8 million and a maximum prediction of a population of 8.8 million in the year 2000.

The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is the newest tool to preserve the environment at the local level. Its avowed purpose of ensuring that the decision makers are explicitly aware of the environmental consequences of the proposed actions, coupled with a finding on the growth inducing aspect, irreversible effects, alternative actions and ways of mitigating adverse consequences have been converted (some would say perverted) into a prime method to stop development. Rather than attack a proposal directly, the sophisticated adversary now attacks the vulnerable E.I.R. on grounds such as it fails to meet the complex legal requirements of the act, that it is incomplete or inaccurate or that the procedure is faulty. It thus becomes the renumeration plaything of attorneys rather than a valid tool for decision making. The time taken on the hearing, appeals, rewriting and resubmittals and further hearings on the E.I.R. often in itself defeats the proposed project on the often proved premise that imposing enough delays on a development is one of the most effective methods of ensuring that it never happens. Its potential use at the Regional level will be mentioned later.





The first and second of the above tools have been jointly used to limit growth in many areas, including the cited examples of Petaluma and San Jose. For rather than using zoning directly to ensure that the holding capacity stipulated by the General Plan is not exceeded, it is used to ensure that population growth remains within the capacity of the available services. Up to now this approval has been the easier to defend legally on the obvious premise that if sewer treatment or water supply capacity is lacking, the rate of population increase is automatically restricted to the rate of increase in their capacity. And as was shown, by refusing to increase water capacity, a policy of no-growth is not only possible but certain. The basic flaw in this approach is that growth control is determined by the special districts who control services. The vaunted ability of general purpose governments to be comprehensive and weigh conflicting viewpoints becomes subordinate to water boards and sanitary districts, whose directors are neither elected for nor capable of determining highly controversial growth issues.

Petaluma's rate of growth is largely based on its sewage and water capacity rather than sewage and water capacity being determined by desired rate of growth. Thus the level of services determine the rates of growth instead of desired growth rates determining the service needs, which rational planning would more logically demand. But if this simplistic but more legally defensible concept is reversed a larger dilemma emerges. Who decides and on what rationale is the growth rate and ultimate holding capacity to be set? Attempts are being made (currently in Marin County) to substitute a "natural" environmental holding capacity for man-made service constrictions whose limits are more vulnerable to growth pressure and hence undesired expansion. But natural environmental constraints generally transcend local and, in this context, artificial political boundaries. To be valid they need to be set at a Regional level. To avoid also the social and economic inequities of only locally determined growth rates, it is vital to add a Regional dimension.

For the effect of growth limiting actions by individual communities cannot be fully understood outside of some larger framework. For the problem of each City and County going their own separate ways is the 'spill-over' effect on neighboring communities. San Francisco's spate of new office buildings causes no increase in its population, but the great numbers of office workers they engender adds to the residential load of the commuter suburbs as Marin. Marin's limited growth policies in turn puts extra pressure on Sonoma to the north. In fact every local jurisdiction imposing limits or encouraging growth puts an equal and opposite reaction on its neighbors. Thus a valid policy to limit growth requires Regional coordination. Before this is discussed, a summary capitulation of key regional actors is necessary to explain the opposing forces in the Regional growth drama.





Fighting to limit growth is the great mass of suburban opinion, where ninety percent of urban growth has occurred during the last decade. No-Growth policy is supported by the Republican "Right", who wish to preserve their attained life style from inundation by hordes of "undesirable" central city residents, and the Democratic "Left", who wish to preserve the natural ecology from "development". They do suffer some conscience pangs from their temporary abandonment of social causes and compensate by talk about the need for low cost housing. The intensity of their push generally varies in indirect proportion to the economic or political feasibility of achieving it. The stable residential enclaves of the central city are also supportive, seeking to erect economic barriers around their neighborhoods through urban design improvements, code enforcements, down zoning, etc., all of which tend to increase housing costs and thus lower densities and growth potential.

Opposing the "No-Growth" are an otherwise strange alliance of core-city minorities, who see No-Growth as a final Establishment ploy to deprive them of the opportunity to emulate the life style of those suburbanites who have it made, many of whom having but recently escaped from their own ethnic ghetto; of "Labor" who see unemployment and economic depression; of "Capital" in the role of Industrialists, Land Owners, Developers, Builders, Chambers of Commerce and Real Estate Boards, an erstwhile establishment now very much on the defensive, who see No-Growth as an obvious threat to vested interests and future profits. The point is that all these actors transcend local boundaries. Although active in the local context, their natural arena is the Region, wherein they fight for the political leverage needed to influence State legislation, which is the key to achieve local and Regional objectives in the absence of effective Regional government.

In response to the need to analyze the Regional issue of managing growth, the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), a voluntary association since 1961 of most of the cities and counties of the Region, has been implementing an intense study of the problem, exemplified by the issuance of four "Issue Papers" and some very tentative Policy guidelines. These, in brief, consists of:

1. Setting a 5.5 million ceiling for the 1980 population with a predicted annual growth rate of 1.7% and a statement of the number of jobs and urbanized land absorption required to sustain the adopted population figures. A new range is established also for the year 2000, down 1 million from the previous maximum of 8.8 million.

2. Committing ABAG to a cooperative process with local government and other regional agencies for establishment of a coordinated Growth Policy. (How far ABAG without mandatory power to overrule local objections can direct growth away from critical areas to areas better able to absorb more growth is not yet clear).





3. Establishing growth criteria to be utilized by ABAG in reviewing local plans and proposals. Typical proposed criteria are in-filling of already committed areas as opposed to further urban sprawl, decreased reliance on the automobile, meeting Bay Area housing needs, etc.

4. Establishing a three year ABAG program to develop growth policy.

Such policies at present are tentative because their three principal components are extremely controversial.

1. Restriction of Natural increase, anticipated to be 60% of the growth component in the 70's, requires a massive birth control effort (or the more euphemistic term "family-planning"). Not only is their strong social and religious opposition to such policies but many in favor feel it is not a legitimate governmental function.

2. Restricting in-migration runs into Constitutional problems of the individual's right to free movement, and also requires restricting job opportunities, which have been the main incentive attracting new workers and their families into the Region. This requires selective limitation on economic expansion, a direct threat to all business interests and conjuring the specter of unemployment to the Unions.

3. An effective policy to optimize the distribution of population growth requires mandatory restrictions in one area and mandatory absorption in another. This would need to be controlled and administered by some "Super Government". This frightens many City Councilmen and Supervisors, who see it as a direct threat to their autonomy embodied in the sacred principle of home rule.

A further problem is the paradoxical situation that the more successful the policy of growth control and other environmental improvements becomes, the more attractive become the Region and the more pressure is generated to move into such a desirable area. It could become the victim of its own success.

One area however in which ABAG has advanced with much more boldness is in Regional Open Space Planning. This is more than just one specific element of the Regional Government Plan of which of course it is a vital component. It also supplements the Growth policies which concentrates on "How Much" and "How Fast" by adding "Where". It does this by avoiding the more politically hazardous path of stating where growth MUST take place, by concentrating on stating where it should NOT take place. By such prohibitions it hopes to concentrate growth according to the principle of the "City Centered Concept" of the Regional Plan. Rather strangely in light of its importance, this is listed as the last of the six purposes of the Open Space Plan under the definition.



6. Shaping Urban Growth - Lands to preserve community identity or to prevent inefficient urbanization. The other five are more specialized.

1. Managed Resources Production - Those lands that are capable of producing a natural product at costs that are "economically viable".

2. Natural and Human Resources Preservation - Those lands of unique or unusual natural or man-made features that would be difficult or impossible to duplicate.

3. Human Health, Welfare and Well-being - Areas where development could cause a long-term deterioration of the general public welfare.

4. Public Safety - The development of lands in this category would present a reasonable probability of direct hazard to life and property.

5. Outdoor Recreation - Land suitable for passive and/or active outdoor recreational pursuits.

But the plan states that the purposes should not be viewed separately, "The Bay Regions Open Space system . . . . is not a collection of parcels designated for permanent preservation in order to reserve separate and distinct open space purposes. It is a target system of open lands planned and managed to serve a multiplicity of open space purposes." It is intended to be the keystone element in implementing the environmental goals of the "Regional Plan 1970:1990" with its feasibility demonstrated by a financial study done by a volunteer Regional group - People for Open Space.

So far this plan has been more promise than fulfillment, with ABAG's Regional Planning Committee (RPC) on the defensive in several key areas to protect its fledgling plan. ABAG has also completed additional elements concerned with the environment, "Regional Airports Systems Plan", "Regional Water, and Sewerage and Drainage Plan, Phase II", "Bay Shore Plan" and a just completed "Ocean Coastal Plan". Currently additional data about the entire region is being generated by the joint USGS/HUD/ABAG. "San Francisco Environment and Natural Resources Planning Study," begun in 1970 and to be completed in 1974. But these plans are for the most part "Paper" plans with the action having been preempted by the several Regional Special Purpose Agencies.

The Bay Region had earlier than most areas been concerned with its natural amenities (before environment becomes a universally fashionable word.) From the pioneering East Bay Municipal Utility District (EBMUD) formed in 1923, designed to abate the smell of raw sewage decomposing on the Oakland mud flats, through the East Bay Regional Park District of 1934 to the recent welcome to the Coastal Commission, following overwhelming local support of State Proposition 20.





But unfortunately coupled with concern for its environment, its people have been and still are profoundly mistrustful of forming a "Super Government" to use the opposition perjorative phrase, with real general purpose and comprehensive planning powers. Great faith has been and still is held in local government's ability to solve environmental problems. When successive problems grew beyond their capability, resources and power to solve, successive Special Districts were formed to solve specific problems. At present, operating directly in the Regional environmental field are air and water control agencies, a sewer agency and Bay and Coastal Planning agencies and three Regional Park districts. In the making is a Solid Waste Disposal agency. Indirectly involved in environmental control are Regional and sub-Regional Transportation agencies. Their roles and activities will be analyzed below in greater depth in approximate chronological order of their formation. They will be referred to by their current name, as many started under a different title.

The State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) was formed in 1949, with 9 subordinate regional basin boards throughout the State. Most of the Bay Area is under the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (SFBRWQCB). It is the only Regional agency with all its members appointed from above by the State so theoretically it can proceed with its job with immunity from local political pressure. In practice this is not the case, preferring to issue cease and desist orders in small communities as Stinson Beach (pop. 480) and Marshall (pop. 170) and only rattle its saber at politically powerful bodies as San Francisco (pop. 680,000), who continue to pour virtually raw sewage into the Bay and Ocean. It is in the process of producing a Bay Area Water Basin Plan to implement the requirements of federal water quality requirements administered by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) so the Region can remain eligible for federal water quality grants.

The standards that are developed will have great impact on the location and capacity of treatment facilities and hence on development. One of the stated criteria; that water be of sufficient purity to allow propagation of shellfish will be extremely costly. The question must be asked as to whether resources spent on achieving such a perfectionist standard could be better spent on improving air quality for example. Only a multi-purpose agency could validly make such a "Trade-off". A water agency is incapable of such a decision. Even more serious perhaps is the emphasis on water purity rather than ecological enhancement. They make no attempt as urged by Barry Commoner and other environmentalists to return the nutrient rich effluent back to the soil, which in many areas desperately needs such enrichment to help agricultural production. This is now accomplished by increasing dosages of nitrates and other chemical fertilizers which in turn compound the problem of water quality as the excess leaches into the run-off. In other words,





is preventing harm e. g. dirty water enough or should they not aim at achieving a positive good i.e. completing the biological circle? Ironically the Army Corps of Engineers, a body only recently converted to environmental orthodoxy, is suggesting such spray irrigation of sewer effluent which certainly is to be commended. Unfortunately its scale is way beyond existing local capacity.

The coming SFBRWQCB plan will substitute for the abortive plan sponsored by the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Study agency formed in 1965. This plan, produced by a consortium of engineers headed by Kaiser, proposed a massive interceptor, a massive treatment plant in San Mateo and a massive outfall to the ocean. It also met massive opposition from the local cities, counties and Conservationists and has conveniently been forgotten. Unfortunately the Water Quality Board also has a predilection for massive regional solutions of liquid waste problems expressed through its policy of giving priority to grants for large sewer treatment plants. (The often more ecologically viable septic tanks are regarded as original sin). Such large capacity plants are often bitterly fought by local agencies as being inordinately expensive and even worse as being catalysts for inducing growth in the locality. They have a contract with ABAG to supply them with the Region's population growth guidelines and distribution but are under no mandatory requirement to conform. At present there is little coordination with local government, and their proposed plan will like that of the Bay Delta Study, be produced without benefit of on going citizen input or cooperation of the Regional Agencies. It is likely to suffer a similar fate.

The Bay Area Air Pollution Control District (BAAPCD) formed in 1955 is composed entirely of locally elected officials appointed by the cities and counties in the Region. They are charged with implementing EPA regulations and the California Environmental Protection Act, as well as responding to Regional and local demands for cleaner air. To accomplish this, besides many regulations of dubious effectiveness, they are also formulating a Regional plan with loose coordination with ABAG. They threaten to control land use in critical areas. This of course outrages local government. They also are using the service limitation tool. EPA, it's parent agency, has required the Water Quality Board to restrict grants for sewer facilities to their designated critical areas. This will be discussed further later. They have no control on the biggest single source of air pollution, the automobile and truck, as control of moving sources has been pre-empted by the State. But they can exercise indirect control by their already mentioned potential control on land uses through prohibiting uses such as intense residential, commercial or industrial activities which requires numerous auto trips and consequently large parking lots and gas stations. The district has been under considerable fire recently for a believed attitude that "it is soft on polluters" and there is a current drive, so far unsuccessful to make it directly elected and hence presumably more accountable. Such charges for example make it adamant in refusing to allow controlled burning on rageland, which is needed to help its fertility. This is particularly desirable in



some Regional Parks which with the removal of grazing have reverted to undesirable flora which previously had been controlled by burning. Being a single purpose agency it cannot make the trade-off between a small increase in air pollution versus a greater ecological benefit.

The Bay Area Sewage Service Agency (BASSA) created in 1971, is also composed of appointed locally elected officials. Its State mandate is to develop a Regional sewage disposal plan by 1974, and to provide for its implementation even if that involves building and operating the treatment plants themselves. It therefore comes into direct conflict with the Regional Water Quality Board as responsibilities and authority are confusingly overlapping. Again a "memorandum of understanding" is being negotiated with ABAG but so far the agency has shown reluctance to lend its powers to limit or create added sewage capacity to add to the arsenal of growth control powers desperately needed by ABAG to implement the Regional Plan. This became very apparent in their response to ABAG's coastal plan where they wrote "The draft report states a premise that control over sewerage facilities means control over growth . . . .We, therefore, recommend that unless this concept is adequately documented, it be weeded out of the report . . . . " As this concept is generally accepted as self evident, it is difficult to escape the conclusion that they don't wish to use their strong but narrow powers to help realize regional goals. They are also viewed with some suspicion by local governments and sanitary districts who fear its given power to enter their jurisdiction and impose a Regional solution with a mandatory tax assessment on the affected property owners. It is therefore treading warily and trying to gain friends by letters to other Regional agencies urging cooperation.

The Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) was made a permanent agency in 1969. It is composed of a mixed bag of Federal, State and locally appointed officials and State appointed Regional citizens. It is probably the best known and most successful of any U.S. environmental protection agency. It owed its origin to the formation in 1961 of the Save the Bay Association, literally founded by three proverbial little old (but very prestigious) ladies in tennis shoes. The Association was concerned about the increasing filling of the Bay and created enough public concern to form a study commission to determine what really was the "Public Interest" in San Francisco Bay. This was over the protests of local governments, each of which was in favor of prohibiting its neighboring community from filling its Bay Front while proceeding to fill its own. ABAG equivocated over the problem and then ducked the issue entirely. The study commission recommended the formation of BCDC in 1965 with the charge that "they prepare a comprehensive and enforceable plan for the conservation of the water of San Francisco Bay and the development of its shorelines". Additionally it was given power to control fill permits during the time the plan was being prepared. After three years of study, a plan was formulated based on trade-offs between twenty-three separate elements ranging from ecology to water front industry. The simultaneous process of planning and permit review although seemingly illogical did successfully lead from the immediate practical consideration of specific problems into developing criteria for long range planning, which in turn fed-back general criteria for judging specific issues. The plan was completed





in 1969 and the agency became permanent with additional powers over inshore priority areas to be reserved for ports, airports, water oriented industry and water front parks. These uses were the few justifiable uses for a limited amount of filling. It also could insist in non-priority areas on "maximum feasible public access" in a strip 100 foot inland from the Bay shore. The plan and ensuing action have balanced Conservation with needed development and its success in halting further fill has been met with great popular support. Again its jurisdiction overlaps with the Water Quality Board, the Transportation Agencies and ABAG's Regional Aviation System Study (RASSA) which advocates extensive fills to the runways to add aviation capacity to San Francisco and Oakland airports -- an issue not yet resolved.

The newest arrival on the Region's environmental stage is the Coastal Conservation Commissions, a result of the passage of a State wide initiative (Proposition 20) in November 1972 following years of legislative inaction. Similarly to the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) and its Regional boards, it consist of a State Commission and six regional commissions but follows BCDC with its memberships split between local officials and State appointment of citizens. In fact BCDC was the model around which it was formed (subsequently it supplied also the key personnel e.g., the Chairman, Executive Director, and Chief Planner all moved over from their identical role in BCDC). It is charged with coming up with an enforceable plan for conserving the California coast by 1974. In the meantime they are given very broad powers to control any and all forms of development within the permit zone, measured 1,000 yards inland from the line of mean high tide. Already the Commission is in the middle of hot controversy between the Coastal Alliance and other conservation groups who contend that too many permits are being issued prior to plan completion and the developer led opposition who contend the permit denials are barefaced confiscation of property rights. The former charge is truer in the South where development pressure is greater and the latter truer in the North (the Bay Area) where conservation influence has traditionally been far stronger.

Unfortunately the Bay Area was split between two Regional commissions, San Mateo county becoming part of the Central Coast Conservation Commission and the balance of the region's coastal counties, San Francisco, Marin, and Sonoma composing the North Central Coastal Commission (of which I am Chairman). Additionally as the basic contention of ABAG's coastal plan was that pressure on the coast was not generated on the coast but was from population pressure from the whole region, confining the representation on the Commission to only the coastal counties and splitting the natural Region between two Commissions is not the most rational context in which to create the plan. Hopefully the State Commission can supply the necessary geographical input and coordinate the separate Regional commission activities, although the Regional commissions are somewhat fearful that because of its central role the State Commission will dominate the planning process at the expense of Regional interests.





It is too early to determine how successfully the Commissions will operate as they are just emerging from the initial flood of permit applications and starting their planning program. This program is a sophisticated process of 13 separate elements (similar to the successful BCDC program) ranging from marine resources to intensity of development. Each element will proceed through an elaborate schedule of analysis, presentation, public hearing, and policy determination from State to Region and back to State where the 13 separate elements will be integrated to form the final plan. By being the first land use agency with real power formed by a popular initiative and with current ferment over coastal conservation, from oil spills, atomic power generators, to exclusive second home subdivisions, they are being closely watched and are certainly where the Regional environmental action is.

As was mentioned before, solid waste disposal is becoming an increasing problem and cries out for a Regional solution. The problem in fact has become worse because of the action of other single purpose Regional agencies. BCDC has virtually prohibited any further sanitary land fills encroaching into the Bay and those existing have a limited capacity. The Air Pollution Control Board has made incineration prohibitively expensive. Neither does ABAG's open space plan favor filling canyons with garbage. ABAG has however initiated a demonstration project with the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association (SPUR) which would through a series of transfer stations, recycle the valuable material and compost the balance to be shipped to the Delta where it would be used to raise the subsiding rich agricultural islands bounded by the Delta waterways. No doubt tradition will be followed and a separate Regional Special Purpose district will be set up to plan and handle the problems and operate the facilities.

The transportation planning and operating agencies obviously have an effect on the environment, both in their influence on land use and levels of pollution and the direct impact of the physical facilities themselves. The Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC, successor to RTPC, successor to BATS) formed in 1971 is again composed of appointed local officials and token representation from State and Regional agencies. It is charged with making a plan for Regional Transportation, its preliminary plan having just been adopted, and being the ongoing umbrella agency to coordinate the various subregional operating agencies as the new Bay Area Rapid Transit District (BART) and the Alameda/Contra Costa Transit District (A/C Transit), etc. Its current clout comes from its control over Federal Grants (which it shares with ABAG) and equally important its power to determine the distribution of funds derived from the sales tax on gasoline (SB 325) to competing transportation agency claimants. The main problem is that it is a single purpose special district whose only function is transportation planning and grant administration. If it is an accepted postulate that transportation should optimize land use,



rather than determine it, such an agency is inherently contradictory to rational planning. Although MTC is charged in the legislation that created it to conform to ABAG's and BCDC's land use plans, and with a memorandum of understanding to that effect, there is no assurance that they will do so. On the one hand is the dilution of ABAG's general plan and planning function as a vital element, transportation is largely removed from its purview and control. On the other hand is the inability of MTC, or any other single purpose district for that matter to make the necessary compromises leading to valid trade-offs between the competing Environmental, Social and Economic goals. These can only be responsibly and democratically accomplished by a General Purpose Government through an ongoing political process. Instead MTC, as a free floating transportation agency with unlimited automatic financing will follow its own perceived agency goals to influence, and in some cases dictate land use with no accountability or responsibility for consequent environmental degradation. In all fairness to MTC they are emphasizing mass transit over further useage of the automobile and are presently exercising a good environmental conscience. But there is no structural requirement to do so and the threat of irresponsible power remains.

A further agency claiming an indirect effect on the environment is the Bay Area Comprehensive Health Planning Council. So far they have been ineffective, but their avowed purpose to include transporation, housing and open space in their planning responsibilities can only confuse regional planning even more, given their amorphous unaccountable composition and their lack of knowledge of such land use elements.

Acting down on the Region are the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970. The implications of the latter act have been widely extended to private development through the decision of 'Friends of Mammoth' v Mono county. They are administered through a multitude of Federal and State agencies whose description is outside the scope of this paper but whose influence is often decisive on Regional environmental planning decisions. Such Federal agencies as EPA, the Army Corp of Engineers, UMTA, HUD to name but a few and State agencies such as the Resource Agency, Fish and Game, Division of Highways are crucial. If Senator Jackson's bill to require a National Land Use policy is passed and if the State of California ever assumed its responsibilities for State urban planning instead of further diminishing the miniscule efforts of the existing State Office of Planning and Research, the effect on the region would be even more magnified. For most of these agencies and forces use the Region as the arena of "operational control" to implement their requirements. And as has been shown, much of the environmental planning of local government should be transferred to the Regional level if equity and achievement is to occur. The balance of this paper will therefore evaluate how well this Region is planning for environmental preservation, where the problem areas are and what reforms are necessary.





Thus the Bay Area, through a multitude of agencies, is working hard to preserve its environment. How successfully can be judged objectively and subjectively. Objective standards are hard to come by as although the retrun of the bay shrimp could be held as an indication that water quality is improving, the decline of the crab could indicate the reverse. The optimistic releases of the various agencies need to be viewed with some suspicion as "improvement" often means that the rate of degradation has not become worse. As we are often dealing with qualitative values such as open space, coastal and Bay preservation, density of development, etc., on which it is difficult to form a quantitative figure, evaluation is also subjective. Such evaluation is generally comparative, against some past and often fictitious golden age, against what it could be now and is not and against perception of present trends which depend on the individuals philosophic anticipation of a bleaker or better future. But unquestionably we are not doing all we can, and we are organizing the fight badly.

The main problem as must have become apparent by now is the lack of an overall strategy in coordinating the local, Regional, State and Federal agencies in their vertical relationship and the Regional special purpose districts in their horizontal relationships. Vertical coordination is to a large degree dependent on improving horizontal coordination. If the present separate Regional agencies can devise a really rational organization that can make the required trade-offs and has the power and resources to implement a comprehensive plan, their working out of satisfactory roles and division of responsibilities upwards and downwards is by comparison a simple job. An immediate benefit would be a feasible and rational method of ensuring that local plans are geared into State goals, using the Region as the clearing house. This of course assumes the necessity of the State developing a overall State land use plan, a subject somewhat beyond the scope of this paper, will shortly be mandated by Congress and inevitable if California is to maintain a liveable future environment. The passage of Proposition 20, the coastal initiative, is a clear demand for the State to become responsive and responsible for overall planning. But already State legislation requires the 410 cities and 58 counties to produce general plans, each of which is to contain nine mandatory elements, all of which have a profound effect on the environment. No review however of these 4,000 nos. total elements by the State is required. Perhaps it is now just as well, for if it were the inadequate State Department of Planning and Research would be swamped by the deluge and even if augmented would still lack the local knowledge to render a meaningful review. But the requirement to produce these plans and elements loses much of its force without a mechanism to ensure mutual compatability.

If however a multi-purpose Regional government were to exist to review the local plans in its particular Region for compatability with each other and the Regional plan, it is then a comparatively simple job to ensure that the nine Regional plans in turn are compatable with each other and the State plan.





The motivation to coordinate should come from the Region if it is to be supported and successful. The authority can only come from the State which up to now has been reluctant to move due to internal dissension within the Region. But unless positive action occurs soon to insist on a comprehensive planning and an implementing program, the confusion and hence the condition of the environment can only get worse as each agency solidifies their own plans in splendid isolation from each other.

The following scenario is quite possible under present arrangements.

Grow North - The air quality Board decides that the air-shed capacity of the East and South Bay counties is approaching its limits and therefore future growth should be directed to the Northern counties and along the coast. This is fought bitterly by the Northern counties, who don't want to become similarly despoiled as is Santa Clara County. It also prematurely jeopardises the Coastal Commissions planning options.

Grow East - MTC determines that the most economic way to expand the use of public transit (a highly laudable goal), is to extend BART through the Livermore-Amador Valley, transforming it to the major growth corridor of the Bay Area. As the Livermore-Amador Valley has the most critical air pollution problem in the Region, this proposal is strongly objected to by the air Quality Board. (This is actually occurring).

Grow South - BASSA decides that Regional sewage facilities are best provided by extending a large interceptor south of San Jose to Gilroy and Morgan Hill based on their waste water plan. A new freeway actually has just been completed facilitating access and hence growth in this direction. This is against San Jose's growth policy and ADAG's desire to balance Regional growth by discouraging the "Grow-South" tilt to the Region.

Grow West - The State Water Resource Control Board, in their basic plan favors San Mateo and especially its coastal zone and that of Santa Cruz county to concentrate growth, with a large sewage works and major outfalls to the ocean. This naturally upsets BASSA and is fought bitterly by the Central Regional Ocean Coastal Commission.

Four opposing growth directions, all lacking some vital services, all using different total populations and rates of growth are hardly a rational planning strategy and hardly will halt deterioration of the environment. And yet that is the direction in which we are in danger of heading. It is unlikely that all the above actions could be taken but some of them are actually beginning to take place and more are highly probable. A few other selected actual issues caused by lack of coordination between different or equivalent levels of government are:



\* Lack of coordination between AC Transit and BART with MTC trying to reach a solution.

\* BART air outlet in front of and thus despoiling a proposed San Francisco bay front park.

\* Proposed Regional wild life refuge in South Bay being threatened by a San Jose airport expansion proposed by State Aviation study proposal.

\* Air pollution board encouraging future industrial locations being on the Coast thus threatening mandate of Coastal Commissions to save the coast.

\* Water Quality Boards equivocation on a Cease and Desist order on San Francisco (already mentioned).

\* Lack of common policy on proposed Southern crossing between MTC, ABAG, BCDC and State Division of Toll Crossing and Highways.

\* Proposed four lane freeway to Half Moon Bay being supported by State Division of Highways, San Mateo county and the city and fought by ABAG coastal plan and Coastal Commission.

\* State Division of Highways attempt to route freeways through the wine growing area of Napa fought by Napa county and ABAG.

\* Regional airport location and growth plans disagreed to by local governments, ABAG, (RASSA), BCDC, and State studies.

\* Conflict between State Water Board and local agencies in reference to consolidation of sewers system.

Many other examples could be given. The thesis of this paper therefore is that it is vital to establish a multi purpose Regional Planning Agency, with mandatory review powers, which can demand coordination between competing agencies so their valid but often contradictory agency goals can be welded to achieve optimum Regional environmental amenity; which can also demand coordination and conformity to Regional goals from local agencies below and can represent the Regions problems and needs effectively to the State and Federal agencies above and which can through rational planning and decision making arbitrate the needed "trade-offs" between environmental considerations, social objectives and economic requirements. At this point it must be admitted that the present system does work after a fashion, otherwise the case could be ruined by overstating it. Firstly the separate jurisdictions do cooperate with each other, from just talking over mutual problems to formal joint-powers agreements. Secondly much of this talk is facilitated by the several public officials who sit on two or more boards and can thus effect some measure of liaison. The danger is that a select





oligarchy who are in such key positions will be making Regional decisions without the full public exposure and debate that the democratic ideal demands. More structured coordination is required through the creation of a visible "Umbrella agency" vested with sufficient authority to achieve the above stated goals.

This is not to imply that such an "umbrella" agency necessarily do all the required research and planning although in selected sectors it might be sensible for it to do so. It certainly need not operate the various facilities which can remain in the relative expert hands of the relevant special districts. Separate studies of air shed capacities can logically be made by the Air Quality Control Board for a specific sub-regional area for example. But how to ensure that population and development remain below those critical limits is a multi-dimensional problem involving type and intensity of land use (local government and ABAG) and the balance between urban land use and open space (local government, ABAG, BCDC and the Coast Commission where applicable). Implementing optimum land use and balance also depends on access and services. Presently access is determined by the transportation agencies (MTC, State Division of Highways and Sub-Regional agencies as BART, Golden Gate Bridge District, AC transit, etc., where applicable). Services are supplied, or not supplied as the case may be by local or sub-regional special districts for water, sewage, and drainage, and by utility companies and monitored by Regional Control agencies (Water Quality, BASSA, etc.). But there is no agency presently equipped to organize and insist upon a rational response to such a multi-dimensional problem. Such one dimensional attempts at control currently being attempted as the desire by EPA to improve air quality resulting in dictation to the Air Pollution Control District to demand of the Water Quality Control Board a blanket prohibition of new sewer facilities in the Region's five southern counties fail as an over-simplistic reaction to complex forces. It does not take into account the differential growth rates dependent on economic and social concern of the separate counties and the use of one tool, limiting the capacity of sewer treatment to control air pollution, could well result in greater water pollution rather than less growth.

The first priority of an "umbrella" Regional agency, therefore would be to determine at one end of the planning spectrum, a total Regional environmental holding capacity and geographical distribution based on the more critical constraints from the regions existing environmental agencies. At the other end would be the sum of the value inputs from local government. The plan would thus form a progression from objective/quantitative to subjective/qualitative criteria.

The former is concerned with a technical evaluation of what, where, and when should be the limits imposed in the Region in whole and in part for seismic safety, slope, drainage, flood, sewage capacity, water quality and supply, air shed capacity and other appropriate criteria from the open space plan. Such a multi-purpose environmental constraint plan could make the





needed adjustments between the present contradictory goals and decide priority of allocations of resources between the more critical sectors and geographical segments which the present single purpose environmental agencies are by definition incapable of doing.

To be added to the input are the constraints and opportunities derived from the policies of the general purpose but locationally limited agencies as the Coastal Conservation Commissions and the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. They are further along the progression as they not only consider objective criteria but also make value judgements as determining "maximum feasible public access", aesthetic consideration as preserving views and view corridors and other non-quantifiable impacts of man-made artifacts.

The input to and output from the counties and cities, all general purpose governments with limited geographical extent and often illogical boundaries is more at the subjective/qualative end of the progression. As previously stated, value judgements of growth rate and holding capacity made by particular local jurisdictions can be subject to charges of capriciousness, exclusiveness and in extreme cases racism. Yet such local determination of values and type of community desired are very basic to the American ethic. As long as such decisions only have a local effect they should be made locally without outside interference. But those that impinge on their neighbors and thus become of regional concern should be fed into a regional matrix. Only in this way can the above stated charges be eliminated or mitigated as the sum of the costs and benefits of local policies on each other can be evaluated and appropriate adjustments made. These in turn should be referred back to the local jurisdiction in a continuous process of political iteration, so that final regional growth policy is derived from an aggregation of local building blocks arranged and sized to conform to a regional design. The goal is to maintain a fair balance between local aspirations and regional equities.

Thus the Regional plan will embody environmental constraints at one end and progress to the sum of local aspirations at the other with a balance between environmental, social and economic goals. A multi-purpose multi-dimensional Regional government with sufficient authority to preempt or mandate coordination between the existing agencies is vital to implement such a Regional plan.

At present only ABAG exists, potentially able to fill this role as the unique agency which is both General Purpose and Regional. But it is relatively powerless, rarely using its only limp weapon, A 95 review. This is a procedure whereby ABAG, as the designated agency of the Federal government, reviews grant application from local governments and districts to certify that they conform to the Regional General Plan as a condition for Federal approval.



This certification is seldom refused and priorities between competing grant application have never been recommended for fear of breaking up the fragile attachments of its component members. If San Francisco should oppose Berkeley's request for a sewer grant, Berkeley could retaliate by opposing San Francisco's next housing grant application. If vetoed the jurisdiction can simply resign from ABAG and often successfully lobby the Federal agency separately for its money. The A 95 weapon is now even limper from "annual arrangement" procedures where the large cities are assured their years allocation of grants, thus completely bypassing the A 95 review. Emphasis on revenue sharing, which is automatic, and hence lessens depending on categorical grants requiring A 95 review and lately the drying up of such grants under Nixon's "Impoundment" policy to try to control inflation.

One area where ABAG could be more effective is if the State would grant it similar review powers as has the Federal government over Environmental Impact Statements (EIR's) now required for all projects having a "significant effect on the environment." If a thorough review and veto power were possible, the EIR procedure would become what it was intended to be by being a valid decisionmaking tool to avoid harm to the environment and would give ABAG some real control over the Region's development.

To bring it some teeth, ABAG is therefore sponsoring legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 2040. This is somewhat euphemistically labelled a "Regional Planning District" in a perhaps naive attempt to head off opposition as it is in reality a limited purpose Regional Government if "authority" is to be accepted as synonymous to "government". Its primary mission is to formulate a plan whose elements are to be:

1. An Environmental Quality Plan
  - A. Comply with criteria of Water Quality Control Board
  - B. Comply with criteria of Air Resources Board
  - C. Comply with criteria of State Solid Waste Management
2. Transportation Plan
3. Open Space Plan - composed of six similar elements as the ABAG Open Space Plan
4. Parks Plan for Regional Parks
5. Land Use Plan (Public and Private Land)
6. Resource management plan for the conservation, development and management of Regional resources.

Its secondary mission is to ensure that local plans would be required to comply with the above elements of the Regional Plan. Any development which was determined to be of Regional concern and which was in nonconformance with the Regional plan could be rejected after a somewhat complicated hearing procedure.





This proposal is but one in a long series of prior proposals dating back from the "Greater San Francisco" movement of 1910 which urged formation of a single municipality based on the borough system of New York, their cause being taken up by the Regional Planning Association in the 1920's. Subsequently proposals by the Bay Area Council, formed in 1945, by the Governor's Commission on Metropolitan problems in 1960, by the Golden Gate authority report in 1961 (Knox AB711) and that of the Bay Area Regional Organization (BARO) all failed, as did a rival ABAG bill (Bagley AB1846) which proposed its representation be appointed rather than elected. A similar fate overtook a proposed Conservation and Development Agency for the Bay Area in 1970 (Knox AB2310) and a S.F. Bay Area Regional Open Space Commission (Marks SB 1400) in the same year. The last big effort, another proposed Regional Conservation and Development Agency in 1971 (Knox AB 1057) also failed and led up to the current proposal described above of the Formation of a Regional Planning District (AB 2040). During all this time a plethora of bills sponsoring Regional Special Purpose districts to solve environmental crisis were introduced, many of which were approved forming the agencies described in this paper.

AB 2040 is unfortunately and probably also the precursor of further similar proposals as its chances of approval appear slight. As assuming it survives the conservative Senate it will in all likelihood be vetoed by an even more conservative Governor who is purported to regard Regional Government as a step toward communism. If the Region was united in desiring such coordinated approval to environmental problems, there would be no problem with its state passage. But cities and counties are still leary of such a "Super Government" and the less enlightened fear diminution of their local powers. Through the League of California Cities and County Supervisor Associations effective opposition under the battle cry of "Home Rule" is mounted in Sacramento. Some of the existing Regional Special Purpose Districts are also fighting AB 2040. Many reasons are given but one suspects the real reason is the prime instinctive imperative to survive shared by all organisms and unfortunately all organizations. Their screams of anguish will have to be ignored and hopefully there will be enough political rationale to eliminate them and absorb their functions in the proposed Regional Government. Some suburbanites, especially the more conservative, fear "Big Government" in principle and fear that it will give a better power leverage to central city minorities to invade the suburbs. Conversely some of these minorities feel it will diminish their political influence in the Central Cities by diluting their power in the Region. Also they fear it will transfer emphasis from social to environmental issues. Even more decisive is the bitter dissension between those advocating direct election to a Regional Government and those advocating its composition be of existing City and County elected officials similar to ABAG. Neither has the power to overcome the other, but both have sufficient power to reduce the credibility of their opponents viewpoint with the consequence that a Regional agency never gets formed.





The forces advocating such a multi-purpose Regional agency are growing in strength, ranging from the Conservationist groups through the League of Women Voters and to the Bay Area Council, composed of the more prestigious and enlightened business leaders of the Region. They realize that disorganized planning however well intentioned alone will not solve the problems. That uncoordinated Regional Special Purpose Districts "doing their thing" reaches a point of diminishing returns, and that you have to have planning equated with government of sufficient extent, power and resources to solve the environmental problems of the Bay Area. This is the optimistic view. The pessimistic view is perhaps paradoxical but still valid.

Because the Bay Area has such environmental beauty it is still worth saving. But because it still has such beauty it is difficult to alert the general public that it is in jeopardy. For when one can gaze over the sparkling Bay at the golden hills on the opposite shore and a fresh clean breeze blows in from the Pacific, it is difficult to believe that it will not always remain so. That it is a heritage that is indestructible. I wish this was the case. But we are in jeopardy of losing this heritage, not through any lack of appreciation but because we remain in blind ignorance that the danger is acute and we must use our brains as well as our hearts to avert it. I hope we wake up before it is too late.





## SELECTED REFERENCES

- Barry Commoner - The Closing Circle. Nature, Man and Technology. 1971  
Barbara Ward and Rene Dubos - Only One Earth, 1972  
Fred Bosselman and David Callies - The Council on Environmental Quality  
The Quiet Revolution in Land Use  
Control, 1971
- Federal Government - National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) 1970  
Presidents Council on Environmental Quality,  
Fourth Report on Environmental Quality, 1973
- California Tomorrow (John W. Abbot, ed.) - Democracy in the Space Age  
Regional Government under a California State Plan,  
1973.  
California, Going, Going, 1962  
The California Tomorrow State Plan
- State of California - California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) 1971  
Assembly Bill 1057 authored by Knox 1971  
"Formation of a Conservation and Development  
Agency for the Bay Area"  
Assembly Bill 2040 authored by Knox, 1972  
"Formation of a Regional Planning District"  
Assembly Bill 1471 authored by Sieroty 1971  
Coastline Conservation  
Division 18 of the Public Resources Code  
Proposition 20  
Coastal Zone Conservation Act Nov. 7, 1972  
Laws relating to the Protection of Environmental  
Quality 1970.
- Association of Bay Area Governments  
ABAG)  
Preliminary Regional Plan for the San Francisco  
Bay Region, 1966  
Regional Plan 1970:1990 adopted 1970  
Regional Open Space Plan Phase II Summary 1972  
How to Implement Open Space Plans Vol. 1, 2 & 3  
of Implementation programs and a proposal for  
governmental organization. 1973  
Issue Paper #1 Urban Growth Policy Feb. 1972  
#2 Formulation of Regional Growth  
Policy Nov. 1972  
#3 Zoning and Growth March 1973  
#4 Formulation of Regional Growth  
Policy Oct. 1973  
Ocean Coastal Plan 1973  
Regional Water, Sewage and Drainage Plan 1971  
Regional Airport Systems Plan 1973

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY  
AUG 28 1974  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

78 01163

U.C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C123309222

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL  
STUDIES LIBRARY

AUG 29 2024

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA